



Review of LEP Cost Model for Essential Programs and Services

**Presentation to
Joint Standing Committee on Education and
Cultural Affairs**

David L. Silvernail, Director
Maine Education Policy Research Institute
University of Southern Maine Office

January 2006

Goal

The goal of Maine's Essential Programs and Services Model is to insure that all schools have the programs and services that are essential if all students are to have equitable educational opportunities to achieve Maine's *Learning Results*.

Fundamental Premises of Essential Programs and Services

- There must be adequate resources to achieve desired outcomes.
- There must be equity in the distribution of adequate resources.

EPS Cost Components for Specialized Student Population

- Special Needs Children
- Disadvantaged Youth
- Early Elementary Age Children (K-2 grades)
- Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Children

2005-06 EPS Cost Allocation Formula for LEP Programs

	<u>Number of LEP Children</u>		
	1-15	16-250*	251+
Weight	0.50	0.30	0.60

*Adjustment for 16-26 LEP children programs equal to difference between application of .50 and .30 weights.



Review of the Costs to Provide Services to Limited English Proficiency Students

PL 05, c. 12 (LD 468), Sec. UU-7

Review of the most recent data available related to the costs borne by school administrative units that are providing services to limited English proficiency students. The commissioner may consult with the Maine Educational Policy Research Institute within the University of Southern Maine to conduct this review.

Preliminary Updated EPS Cost Allocation Formula for LEP Programs

	<u>Number of LEP Children</u>		
	1-15	16-250	251+
Weight	0.60	0.30	0.30

A comparison of the two weighted matrices revealed:

1. The new weights present the same problem as the original matrix for SAUs with more than 15 and fewer than 26 LEP children (i.e., a decline in LEP allocations).
2. The weight declined for the largest group (i.e., 251+ LEP children) because it appears that in these SAUs regular per pupil expenditures have increased more than LEP expenditures in recent years.

Issues Identified Through Additional Analyses

1. Variances in LEP expenditures for similar size LEP programs.

District	No. of 2004-05 LEP Students	2004-05 LEP Expenditures
CSD914 – Great Salt Bay	1	\$30,502
SAD3 – Unity	1	\$2,795
Yarmouth	1	\$400
 		
SAD35 – Eliot	5	\$26,530
Gorham	5	\$7,825
 		
Union 7 - Saco	13	\$47,002
SAD57 – Waterboro	13	\$24,490
 		
Scarborough	36	\$147,771
SAD71 - Kennebunk	37	\$62,150

Issues (Continued)

2. SAUs have different staffing approaches

District	No. 2004-05 LEP Students	2004-05 LEP Expenditure s	<u>Percent of Expenditures</u>		
			Teacher Salary & Benefits	Teacher Aides Salary & Benefits	Contracted Services
SAD3 – Unity	1	\$2,795	-	100%	-
CSD914 – Great Salt Bay	1	\$30,502	43.3%	56.7%	-
Freeport	18	\$46,630	-	100%	-
SAD37 - Harrington	22	\$23,059	-	65.3%	34.7%

Issues (Continued)

3. Lack of any statewide staffing guidelines for providing LEP programs and services.
4. SAU expenditures only approved for direct service salaries and benefits, and contracted services.
 - Very preliminary review of SAU expenditures indicates SAU expenditures may range 40-60% above approved costs.



Recommendations for 2006-07

1. The original weighting matrix be used in calculating 2006-07 LEP allocations;
2. The 2005-06 allocation adjustment be continued through 2006-07;
3. A new LEP component be developed for implementation in the 2007-08 EPS funding formula.